



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

cathedra lecture and the seminary. It is unfortunate that Mr. Houston should think it necessary to discredit the practice of delivering lectures in order to advocate his own favorite method of teaching. He has done useful work in compiling this book ; but decrying a particular system of teaching, with which he has no sympathy, has no legitimate connection with the collection of constitutional documents. It was well enough to suggest the manner in which he thought the book might be most advantageously used, but it was not necessary to condemn other methods, and the omission of these unnecessary remarks would have secured for the book an even more hearty welcome than has been accorded it.

CANADA AND THE CANADIAN QUESTION. By GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L.
Pp. 325. Macmillan & Co., 1891.

If all that has been published recently upon the condition of Canada were collected into a sacred volume, to be made the political guide of benighted Canadians, Mr. Goldwin Smith's contribution would be unanimously accepted as the Book of Lamentations. He is the Jeremiah among those sincerely interested in Canadian affairs. For his profound and varied attainments, for his acknowledged literary ability there is the utmost respect and admiration throughout the Dominion, but that constant dissatisfaction which his writings exhibit, that continual tendency to belittle, to put the worst possible face on everything Canadian, is extremely irritating to the greater part of the reading public of Canada. It very materially lessens his influence, which might otherwise be a power in the country.

His last book is no worse in this respect than much else that he has written. He advocates commercial union with the United States, a measure which most all thinking Canadians believe would be for their country's good. But as usual with what he advocates, most Canadians do not believe that it can be attained at present. It is the belief that the United States would not entertain the proposition, rather than any lack of faith in "commercial union" that keeps the great majority of Canadians from expressing themselves more heartily in its favor.

It is not, however, his open advocacy of commercial union nor his unavowed advocacy of political union that is distasteful. Every one is ready to respect his convictions upon these points. But the manner in which he advocates his views is very annoying, if not humiliating to many Canadians. We do not object to being convinced that annexation is for our benefit, but we do object to being held up to the world as a people that must soon be starved into annexation. We are not *in extremis*.

His professed object in this book is to discuss "the Canadian Question." Before doing this, however, he affects to put the reader in possession of all the facts of Canadian history pertinent to the argument. It is in this part of his book that he makes Canada and Canadians cut so indifferent a figure. It might be difficult successfully to controvert his more important historical conclusions; but there is a lack of anything like sympathy with the struggles and difficulties in Canadian politics, which may not always have found their best solutions, but which nevertheless deserve honorable rather than dishonorable mention. He seems to be unconsciously controlled by a notion that Canada is a poor little place that has not sufficient intelligence to accept his advice and thereby become happy and great. In accordance with this notion he seems to see only that part of Canadian history which feeds his misconception; and even this he relates with that disparaging, half-hidden irony of which he is such a master. This is the impression his book makes upon many of his fellow citizens. That he intends to be strictly impartial and to be of the utmost service to the country no one doubts. He is conscientious to a fault, but, nevertheless, his book seems to many calculated to convey an unjust impression of Canada to those who do not know her as she is.

He represents the people of Quebec as an utterly unenterprising and shiftless race, without energy and without ambition; as a people who are entirely inimical to all that is British and all that is Canadian, unless it be French Canadian. To establish this view, he quotes some words of the Prime Minister of Quebec, uttered in a moment of enthusiasm at a banquet, which was given by a French national club to do him honor

upon his achieving victory at the polls. He complains bitterly that the hall on such an occasion should be profusely decorated with French flags while only one Canadian flag was to be seen. He thinks it very significant that the Premier should declare that the victory they celebrated was a national (in the sense of French) victory. Another portentous sign is found in the fact that Sir George Cartier, a prominent French-Canadian politician, said on one occasion that the French-Canadians were much exercised over the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian war.*

That the inhabitants of Quebec have always been, are now, and are likely to continue to be French Catholics, he might have saved himself the trouble of proving, and it has long been cheap knowledge that they were not so "progressive" as their Anglo-Saxon neighbors. These, however, are not facts that should drive sensible Canadians to distraction. Under the present arrangement it makes but little difference to the people in other parts of the Dominion whether the inhabitants of Quebec are French or English, Catholic or Protestant. Ontario has no right to demand that Quebec become English or that she become Protestant. Her right is to demand that Quebec should pay her honest share of the burdens of Federal government and receive only her fair proportion of patronage and advantage from the government. If the citizens of Quebec did this, there would be nothing alarming in the fact of their being French or of their being Catholic. If they do not bear their share of the national burdens,—and I am fully convinced that they do not,—the remedy is not to be found in reproaching them with being French and Catholic. The remedy is in the hands of the electors. Once any party convinces the people of the other Provinces that Quebec is getting an undue proportion of Federal money, there will go to Ottawa at the next election a majority of men pledged to the removal of the injustice. The giving of subsidies from the Dominion to the Provinces is, as Mr. Smith points out, undoubtedly a defect in our Constitution. But to declare, as he seems to,

(* Pp. 18, et seq.)

that it cannot be changed is mere childishness, and to believe that it is more difficult to change it than it would be to make an alteration of similar importance in the Constitution of the United States, is to be deluded. If the Canadian people were as united in requesting the change as the American people must be before they can amend their Constitution, the British Parliament would make the change at once. All that is necessary to secure any change in the Constitution is a reasonable amount of unanimity among the Canadian people. The British Parliament will not hesitate to give official recognition to any such change in Canadian sentiment as is clear and pronounced. Mr. Smith himself intimates his belief that the British Parliament would pass an act sanctioning a political union of Canada with the Republic, but in the same breath asks us to believe that she would not amend the British North America Act!

The truth is that Ontario's political leaders, no less than Quebec's, are afraid to speak out and propose that the provinces should support the provincial governments by direct taxation. "The people won't stand it" is the undercurrent of opinion one finds among Canadian politicians, French and English alike. So long as the people do not believe the change to be in their interest, no change can be made. But let us be honest about it, and instead of reproaching Quebec with being French, admit that the explanation is that the people of the Dominion are under the sway of party, and that voters think more of party victory than of good government.

Again Mr. Smith takes occasion to suggest that French loyalty to Canada could not be relied upon in case of war with the United States, because two-sevenths of the French Canadians are across the line; entirely forgetting the fact which he so repeatedly makes use of elsewhere in his argument, that nearly one-fifth of the English-Canadians also are in the United States. The French-Canadians might, with almost as much reason, impeach the loyalty of English-speaking Canadians upon this score.

It is not in reference to the race problem only that Mr. Smith takes a dark view of Canadian affairs. He intimates

on very insufficient grounds that in Canada there exists a practice of "working out" or exhausting farms and moving on to newer lands. It is doubtful if one abandoned farm can be found in Ontario. To believe that such an occurrence is common in Canada is to be mistaken.

He also has his fling at the offices of Governor General and Lieutenant Governor. It would be unwarranted to suppose that his estimate of the importance of these offices at all represents Canadian opinion. It has indeed become fashionable of late with some to say smart things at the expense of their occupants, but both the officials and the offices are generally respected by the people. Not only so, but many thinking Canadians are not at all convinced that we would improve either our officials or our system of government by electing men to these places.

The statement, again that Canada is supporting eight constitutional monarchies¹ is true only in the sense in which it is true that the United States are supporting forty-five constitutional monarchies. If the Provincial Government officials were too well paid we could have their salaries reduced.

It would not be just to the kindly spirit which Canadians feel towards British subjects to pass unnoticed the warning given to educated Englishmen who contemplate seeking employment in Canada. Mr. Smith thinks the individual Englishman is received with jealousy and distrust, that he does not get in Canada that even-handed justice which is meted out to him in the United States.² No Englishman need expect that in Canada the mere fact of being English will set him above natives who are equal to himself in ability and education, though it does make his chances for promotion as good as those of a native. Other things being equal he will not be, as was once the case, preferred before a Canadian; but he will be preferred before all others except Canadians. To expect more than this is only to affect superiority which is always offensive. The very fact which Mr. Smith relates—that three Englishmen have been appointed to chairs in the University

1. Pp. 234.

2. Pp. 52.

of Toronto within about a decade—is sufficient to overthrow his argument. Which of the great American universities have appointed three Englishmen to their most important and lucrative positions in that time?

In discussing the “Canadian Question” as a matter of practical politics, Mr. Smith has offered nothing new in either argument or information, but all the facts that have been heretofore adduced by various writers and speakers in favor of closer commercial and political relations with the United States are marshalled with his usual skill and acknowledged ability. The humiliation of being a dependency is noticed and made responsible for the lack of national spirit among Canadians. The difficulties in the way of independence are considered and not deemed insurmountable although great. And the glorious future that Canada might enjoy as a part of the great republic is set forth. He declares that there is no natural trade between the provinces; that their natural markets are to the south, and that the fiscal policies of both Canada and the United States, which keep the two countries from trade are the result of blundering or boodling.

The book is full of entertaining and useful information. To Americans, Australians, Englishmen and Canadians desiring a picture of Canadian social and political life it will be valuable. It must, however, be taken *cum grano*. Attention has been called to a few of the positions taken up by the author in which very many Canadians would not concur, and of much else in the book it might be said in Mr. Smith’s own phrase “readers had better inquire.” He has presented a view of Canadian life and politics for the purpose of advancing a political movement, and in reading the book this fact must never be forgotten. His book must not be mistaken for history. It is a clever piece of pamphleteering executed with great literary ability, but it is not—and perhaps was not intended to be—a valuable contribution to political science or Canadian history.

JOHN M. McEVoy.

Toronto, Ont., July 17, 1891.